



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/661,129

09/12/2003

Jeffrey George

60518-161

7732

27305

7590

05/22/2006

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.
THE PINEHURST OFFICE CENTER, SUITE #101
39400 WOODWARD AVENUE
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-5151

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, ROSS A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3713

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/661,129 | Applicant(s) GEORGE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Ross A. Williams | Art Unit 3713 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/29/05 5/23/05</u> | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>IDS 1/16/04</u> |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The applicant has misspelled the word "host" as "hose" on paragraph 90 line 2.

Applicant has refers to "remote network interface" as reference number 66.

Examiner believes the correct reference number is 68

Appropriate correction is required.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 26 and 23 state the limitation of "an assigned type". This terminology is not supported by the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 27 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims state the limitation of "an assigned type". It is unclear as to what the "assigned type" is.

Claim Objections

Claim 14 objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 14 recites the limitation "the identification card number" in line 2. The Examiner believes the applicant meant "the identification number". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 6 – 11, 17, 28 – 31, 38, 43, 44 – 47, 53 and 64 - 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jaeger et al (US 6,650,346).

Claim 1, 17, 28, 29, 30, 31, 38, 43, 53, 64, 65, 66 and 67: Jaeger et al (hereafter Jaeger) discloses a system of classifying equipment in an asset management database for inventory. This asset management system comprises an asset database 2 of inventory data, a report generation system 4, and a web agent 6 and a web server 8 for delivery of the reports to clients. The asset database comprises an aggregation of asset information from remotely located customer sites, input to the database via one or

Art Unit: 3713

more service technician workstations 10. The report generation system 4 preferably comprises a report server programmed with a report generation toolkit. The information in database 2 is queryable using the report generation toolkit to produce formatted reports, such as those shown in FIGS. 6 and 7 (Jaeger 4:37 – 48). Jaeger discloses that the system is queryable based upon the identification of a device such as a device number. Jaeger discloses various fields that a data entry person can enter pertaining to a device such as the model number, part number, manufacturer, device type code, modality code, serial number denomination value etc (FIG 1 – 7). These pieces of information are then stored in the asset database (Jaeger 5:8 – 11). A user or customer can then use these classification fields such as the device serial number to retrieve information from the centralized database for reports on equipment or device information (Jaeger 6:60 – 62).

Claim 6: Jaeger discloses the device has a web client (Jaeger 4:37 – 40) and inherently has a processor.

Claim 7: The web client acquires and presents data to the user (Jaeger 4:52 – 60).

Claim 8 – 11, 44 – 47: The web client receives fillable forms that the user is able to enter device identification that is thus sent in the form of device information queries that are used to retrieve device information from the centralized database (Jaeger 4:52 – 60, 6:23 – 63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2 – 5, 15, 39 – 42, 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaeger et al (US 6,650,346) as applied above, and in view of Malkin et al (US 7,035,814).

Claims 2 – 5 and 39 - 42: Jaeger discloses a web-based system that for managing assets that operates on a network such as the Internet (Jaeger Fig 1). Jaeger does not disclose that the network utilizes wireless connections, wherein the wireless connections are IEEE 802.11/b/g. It is well known in the art to use wireless connections when operating networked equipment over the networks such as the Internet. The wireless protocol standards such as IEEE 802.11/b/g are also well known conventional standards for wireless protocols. This is seen by the teaching of Malkin et al (hereafter Malkin). Malkin discloses a system that utilizes device identification by

means of a barcode scanned by a barcode scanner, RFID tags sensed by a RFID sensor, or manual input of Device identification by means of an alphanumeric entry device (Malkin 4:37 – 59). Malkin discloses that the user of the remote device can query a store server for more in-depth information relating to a particular product. After the system identifies the queried product the system relays the device or product information to the user (Malkin 5:3 – 14). Malkin discloses that the device may operate on a network by means of wireless protocols such as IEEE 802.11a/b/g (Malkin 4:3 – 8).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Jaeger in view of Malkin to provide an asset management system that operates over a network in accordance with wireless protocols such as IEEE 802.11a/b/g. This enables the user of the remote device to be mobile and thus operate the remote device in many types of environments in order to receive device information.

Claim 15, 51: Jaeger does not disclose the remote device being connected to a barcode reader. Malkin discloses a system that utilizes device identification by means of a barcode scanned by a barcode scanner, RFID tags sensed by a RFID sensor, or manual input of device identification by means of an alphanumeric entry device (Malkin 4:37 – 59). Malkin discloses that the user of the remote device can query a store server for more in-depth information relating to a particular product. After the system identifies the queried product the system relays the device or product information to the user (Malkin 5:3 – 14).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Jaeger in view of Malkin to provide a remote device that is connected to a barcode reader for scanning in

device numbers. A barcode reader would facilitate the faster entry and a less error prone way of entering device numbers into a system.

Claims 12 – 14, 16, 18 – 27, 48 – 50, 52, 54 – 57 and 59 - 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaeger et al (US 6,650,346) as applied above.

Claims 12 and 48: Jaeger discloses a system that retrieves devices information from a database, based upon the device identification such as a serial number. Jaeger does not disclose that the device is an electronic gaming device. It should be noted that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to retrieve device information in regards to an electronic gaming device. Jaeger teaches the retrieval of information in regards to many types of electronic devices that are used in hospitals and other environments. It would be obvious to retrieve device information of a device depending on the setting or functionality of the device (i.e. gaming, healthcare, accounting, etc.).

Claims 13, 14, 49 and 50: Jaeger discloses asset management system that wherein a user enters or fills the database with device information such as the device number, so that reports or device information can be retrieved based upon the device info. When a user enters the device number for retrieval of information pertaining to a specific device the system determines if the device number is valid. If the device number is invalid or the device number is not in the database the report will not be able to convey any information pertaining the user's entered device number.

Claim 16 and 52: Jaeger discloses the user inputting the device number (Jaeger 5:41 – 43, 6:49 – 62).

Claims 18 – 22 and 54 – 57: Jaeger discloses a database for storing records of devices in an asset management system. Jaeger does not specifically disclose that the database contains database tables. Including information data in database tables is a well-known feature. It would have been within the level of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide such feature in order to facilitate data storage and retrieval. Jaeger also discloses does not specifically state the use of data objects, however, Jaeger discloses the retrieving and storing of data such as the device number, serial number, manufacturer, vendor, part number, description etc (see Jaeger FIG 2 – 7), that are couple together to form a data record of a device. These pieces of information are stored in the data record in a database. Thus, a means is used to retrieve and store and transform this data in a format understandable to the user.

Claim 23 and 59: Jaeger discloses the device has a web client (Jaeger 4:37 – 40) and inherently has a processor. The web client acquires and presents data to the user (Jaeger 4:52 – 60). The data presented to the user is presented in HTML format (Jaeger 4:52 – 56).

Claims 24 – 27 and 60 - 63: Jaeger discloses a web client that accesses a web server in order to access web content and database information pertaining to device information as discussed above. Jaeger also provides a menu-based layer for organizing the systems input screens (Jaeger Figs 1 – 7). Jaeger also discloses a login

layer for providing access to the web pages. If a user can provide valid credentials then they will be able to access appropriate data sets on the servers. If the credentials are deemed invalid then they will not be provided access. However, Jaeger does not disclose the use of servlets to provide functionality to the management system. It is well known that a servlet is a Java program that extends the functionality of a Web server by generating dynamic content and interacting with web clients using a request- response paradigm. Servlets are referred to as server-side applets or applications. : Similar to the way applets run on a browser and extend a browser's capabilities, servlets run on a Java-enabled web server and extend the Web server's capabilities. It is well known to those skilled in the art that servlets may be local or remote. Servlets may reside on a web server receiving a request from a web client or may be located on a server remotely located from the web server receiving a web client request. Jaeger discloses using web interface to view web pages on the Internet (Jaeger 4:54 – 56). Accordingly, it would be well within one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide such feature into the Jaeger system to provide a sophisticated system to users.

Claims 32 - 37 and 68 – 73 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaeger et al (US 6,650,346 in view of Rowe (US 6,645,077)).

Claims 32 – 37 and 68 - 73: Jaeger discloses an asset management system that provides a user a way to query the database for specific information pertaining to a specific device. The system then returns to the user a plurality of pieces of information.

Jaeger does not disclose receiving device information wherein the information is a master prom, game prom MAC address, TCP/IP address, date on floor, or value of a meter. However, Rowe discloses a game system that is used in conjunction with a data repository to retrieve information pertaining to gaming devices. Rowe discloses that the repository may hold information pertaining to game device components, and software components (Rowe 9:35 – 56). Queries can be made to find out coin-in, coin-out value, amount bet per game, times, game versions, locations (Rowe 9:65 – 10:5, 10: 35 – 67). As can be seen in FIG 3 of Rowe, many different types of data may be collected and stored in relation to the game machine such as software and hardware components, paytables, bonuses etc.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Jaeger in view of Rowe to provide an asset management system that conveys device information. It would be obvious to include various types of info such as master prom, game prom MAC address, TCP/IP address, date on floor, or value of a meter. These are pieces of information that pertain to the hardware components of an electronic device. Thus providing the user with this information would provide a more thorough and useful system.

Citation Of Pertinent Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 2001/0056386: Software and Hardware auditing system.

US 6,154,738: Method of returning product information.

US 5,804, 803: Retrieving Device information.

US 2003/0023516: Inventory Management database.

US 2001/0029528: Database servlets.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ross A. Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-5911. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on 571-272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RAW
RAW
5/12/06


XUAN M. THAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TC3700